Mythopoeic Society MYTHLORE A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature

Volume 9
Number 2

Article 12

6-15-1982

An Inkling's Bibliography (21)

Joe R. Christopher
(emeritus) Tarleton State University, Stephenville, TX

Mythcon 51: A VIRTUAL “HALFLING” MYTHCON

July 31 - August 1, 2021 (Saturday and Sunday)
http://www.mythsoc.org/mythcon/mythcon-51.htm

Mythcon 52: The Mythic, the Fantastic, and the Alien

Albuquerque, New Mexico; July 29 - August 1, 2022
http://www.mythsoc.org/mythcon/mythcon-52.htm

Abstract

A series of bibliographies of primary and secondary works concerning the Inklings.

AN INKLINGS' BIBLIOGRAPHY

(21) Compiled by Joe R. Christopher

This Bibliography is an annotated checklist covering both primary and secondary materials on J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and the other Inklings. Authors and readers are encouraged to send off-prints or bibliographic references to the compiler:

Dr. J.R. Christopher
English Department
Tarleton State University
Stephenville, Texas 76402 USA

Becker, Joan Quall (adaptor). Till We Have Faces. A drama produced on 29-30 March, 5-7, 19-21 April 1979 at the Edyth Bush Theatre, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Not seen. Directed by Marc Gable; Produced by C. Tag Productions for the Christian Theatre Artists Guild; Terry Olson, Producer. The Cast:

Fox...John Dickerson
Redival...Diane M. Keller
Psyche...Pam Griffith
Orual...Mary Frances Gable
King of Glome...Jack Kettles
Bardia...Michael Stadtmueller
Priest of Ungit...Bernard Marks
Trunia...Dan Foster
Ansit...Roberta Gackle.

Ruth Berman writes about the play in a personal letter (18 September 1981): "It was dreadfully acted, so much so that I'm not sure if the script was equally awful, or if it had some merits hidden by the staging." [The bibliographer wishes to thank Berman for sending him a copy of the program.]

The Charles Williams Society Newsletter, No. 25 (Spring 1982), [i] + 11 pp. Edited by Mrs. Molly Switek.

Excluding various notices for the members of the Society, one finds these materials on Williams: (a) Martin Moynihan, "Chesterton and Charles Williams (The Ballad of the White Horse and Taliessin Through Logues)", pp. 2-3. Williams' image of the headless Emperior of P'o-L'u and Chesterton's references to the recurrence of evil suggest a similarity of attitude. Moynihan mainly quotes passages from The Ballad of the White Horse; the comparison is not very thoroughly developed, and his suggestion that Williams may have drawn upon Chesterton's imagery is not supported at all. (b) Brian Horne, review of The Passionate God by Rosemary Haughton (1981), pp. 4-5 [Lewis, 4]. Horne's review indicates that in this one of her theological works, Haughton attempts a restatement of Christian doctrines in modern terminology, borrowing Exchange from Williams and quoting from his Arthurian poems in her last chapter. She also uses Lewis's The Allegory of Love for a discussion of Romance at the first of the book. Horne finds the treatment of Romance simplistic, that of Exchange very good, and the book as a whole flawed.

(c) James Brabazon, "'Greater Joy': A Comparison between Charles Williams and Albert Schweitzer", pp. 5-11 [the paper was transcribed by the editor from a recording]. Brabazon, invited to talk to the Society because of his biography of Sayers, chose to discuss the impact Williams and Schweitzer had on him, using as a title a phrase from Williams' translation of Dante which suggests that belief comes from "Greater Joy". Brabazon describes his one sight of Williams, reciting some of his poetry at St. Anne's House. After Williams' death, he began reading all of his works he could find; his response was not that of Sayers, finding it a strange world, but one of finding it "our own world seen in a very special light and by a very special person" (p. 6). A primary quality of Williams' approach is that of affirming everything. "I think that CW . . . would have said that people who were in a state of ungrace willed that and willed the consequences of it. He would rejoice that the pattern made that happen" (p. 7). The stylized, "high-pitched" way in which Williams wrote was appropriate for his vision.

Brabazon later acted in The House of the Octopus. He found it a valuable work - but one which the average theatre goer, seeing it one time with no preparation, could not be expected to understand.

Then Brabazon gives a brief account of Schweitzer's life with some comments about the biography he wrote of him. Brabazon cites two apparent differences between the two men which are not as valid as they first appear: Schweitzer as a man of action and Williams, a man of literature; Schweitzer as a heretic and Williams, orthodox. The first is inadequate because both were involved in inner penetration with the check of reason. The second, because "both of them pinned their final apprehension of religion on the figure of Jesus" (p. 10) and because Williams did not deny greatness to the great heretics. Finally, they were alike in that "[b]oth of them were ecstatics and both were deeply practical" (p. 10). Ecstatics seems to mean that they were visionary in one way or another: Schweitzer's phrase "the solidarity of life" has some of the meaning of Williams' "co-inherence". Likewise, Schweitzer's "reverence for life" and Williams' emphasis on "courtesy" have similar practical applications.

Derrick, Christopher. C. S. Lewis and the Church of Rome: A Study in Proto-Ecumenism. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981. 225 pp. [Dundas-Grant, Hardie, Havard, all 36; W. H. Lewis, 39-40; Mathew, 36; Tolkien, 36, 40, 46; Williams, 23; Inklings generally, 139; passages from new Lewis letters, 53, 95-97.]

Derrick, a Roman Catholic, a pupil and friend of Lewis, has written a cleverly phrased and well argued discussion of Lewis's attitudes toward Roman Catholicism. It offers a few new biographical passages - Lewis played always on the Protestant side in childhood games of Catholics vs. Protestants in Belfast (pp. 26-27); as an adult Lewis once hurried over to Drogheda to keep his brother from becoming a Catholic (pp. 39-40); in a discussion between Lewis and Derrick, Derrick "proved" God to be a Logical Positivist (pp. 213-214). (Other passages in which Lewis is quoted from his conversations with Derrick appear on pp. 85 and 224.)

Ch. I, "Belfast, Oxford, Rome", is a biographical survey of Lewis's religious opinions: Belfast Protestantism in childhood; appreciation of the Church of Rome's picturesqueness during his atheistic phase (which Derrick, on the basis of Spirits in Bondage, calls actually a Gnostic

or Manichaean phase); and an adulthood which combined some Ulsterite prejudices with many Catholic (or Anglican High Church) practices. (The latter parenthesis is not in Derrick; he simply considers them Catholic.) "Only by the narrowest nit-picking standards of the canon lawyer and the ecclesiastical theoretician was he separated, in his later years, from the Church of Rome" (p. 39). Derrick also discusses Lewis's refusals to debate or even discuss Church differences as symptomatic, in part, of Lewis's uneasiness with facing the existence of the Roman Church. Derrick uses evidence, and an argument based on what is not said, from That Hideous Strength at the beginning of the chapter to show Lewis's avoidance of confronting the Roman claims, and stays with largely non-fiction works and letters thereafter. The book is well documented, and this largely factual approach is carried throughout (except for the postscript).

Ch. II, "A Change of Religion?", analyzes not Lewis's emotional reactions to Roman Catholicism but his intellectual treatment of it. The work most cited is English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, which, despite its literary emphases, does record some of Lewis's ideas about the Reformation in England; but the most important work for Derrick's book is a previously unpublished letter (of 9 May 1945 to H. Lyman Stebbing) in which Lewis stated his disagreement with the Roman Catholics - with their theology involving the Blessed Virgin Mary, their papal tradition involving St. Peter, and their doctrine of Transubstantiation (pp. 95-97). But one emphasis of this chapter needs a critical note: Derrick titles the chapter from a passage in English Literature which says that England did change its religion during the Reformation (quoted on p. 67); at other times, as when Screwtape described the Church spread out through the ages (quoted on p. 145) - and presumably the reference, as often in that volume, is to the Church of England - Lewis seems to have held the High Church position of the Reformation being of minor theological significance in the history of Anglicanism, which can thus be traced back through the medieval period and the Church Fathers to the New Testament. This makes the Church of England co-historical with Roman Catholicism and the branches of Orthodoxy. Derrick does not deal with this claim, although he quotes several passages in which Lewis sets up the Bible, Church Fathers, Hooker, and the Book of Common Prayer (with some additions and variations) as theologically normative for his and other Anglicans' beliefs.

Ch. III, "The Discernment of Orthodoxy", begins the second part of the book: the attempt is no longer to describe what Lewis's views of the Roman Church were, but to establish a proper Catholic view of Lewis's writings. In this chapter Derrick treats primarily of the question of "What is the touchstone of orthodoxy, of religious truth?" (p. 116) - upon what is it based, for Lewis and Catholics generally do not accept an emotional, irrational faith. He finds that Lewis does not base religious truth on the Scriptures solely - as would many Protestants - but on Catholic concepts of "the development of doctrine" and "the teaching Church" (p. 124). More precisely, Lewis "circled cautiously round [these] two critical and Catholic concepts, not fully accepting and not finally rejecting either of them" (pp. 123-124). Derrick treats Lewis's various formulations of these well (although a reader occasionally has a feeling that Derrick is taking seriously what was for Lewis an ad hoc debating position - e.g., the passage from Mere Christianity on p. 123). And Derrick suggests that Lewis's belief in Purgatory was not supportable in Lewis own terms of authority (pp. 132-133). (Perhaps Lewis accepted Dante as coming between the Church Fathers and Hooker as an authority, as part of the teaching Church. But Lewis sometimes seems to be interested in the most highly developed instance of a belief rather than a consensus; this may be a Protestant - or, at least in Derrick's terms, certainly a non-Catholic - side of his thought.)

Ch. IV, "The Church and the Denominations", traces Lewis's various attitudes toward the Church, in various senses of the word; discusses at length Mother Kirk's appearance in The Pilgrim's Regress and the hall-and-rooms metaphor of Mere Christianity; and cites Lewis's brief, rare comments about Church hierarchies. Lewis is found lacking a full understanding of the Church, preferring the English tendency to muddle through. It seems odd that here (or elsewhere) Derrick does not note that Lewis indicated Henry VIII's damnation in "Screwtape Proposes a Toast"; of course, the context is fictional, but, as in Dante's damnation of certain Popes in L'Inferno, it indicates an attitude of importance.

Ch. V, "'Mere Christianity' and the Paradox of Ecumenism", is a curious chapter. Derrick traces three ways in which Lewis contributed to ecumenism: he preached and practiced courtesy to those of other churches; he stressed what Christians had in common and politely refused to debate those points upon which they differed; he hoped for the future a Christian unity might be achieved, probably originating outside of the Church hierarchies. Derrick spends some space attacking the latter two ideas as he finds them in current ecumenical movements; there is nothing necessarily wrong with this practice - Lewis had a tendency to get off the main topic in his books - but it is a by-path.

The Postscript, "What If Lewis Had Become a Catholic?", shows Derrick's heart - his love for Lewis - in the same way that much of the rest of the books shows his head, well trained for debate under Lewis's tutoring. The Postscript is a genial estimate of what a Catholic Lewis would have been like.

In general, Derrick's book is a valuable, well-argued book, which indicates Lewis's attitudes toward and sometimes closeness to Roman Catholicism. Since Derrick calls himself "a Catholic controversialist" (p.106), the points are, as expected, driven home. Not every one of them is convincing to a non-Roman Catholic, of course. "Is it possible to establish a coherent but not papistical discernment of orthodoxy? If a man of Lewis's intellectual power tried to do so and failed, the task may be, as I take it to be in fact, an impossible one" (p. 138). The Patriarch of Constantinople has no coherent discernment of orthodoxy? (Within the limits of Derrick's non-Protestant understanding of orthodoxy, the complete absence of comments about the Orthodox Churches anywhere in his book seems odd. He is very much carrying on an Anglican-Roman dialogue in most of this volume). Other weaknesses include the summary of letters from Lewis to a Roman priest which indicate Lewis was wishing to become a Roman Catholic; the particular priest published a letter about his claim, with a more neutral quotation from Lewis, soon after Lewis's death - but he has since lost the letters (pp. 214-215). Lost letters, as Derrick knows, are not proof positive. At one point, a discussion of how the word Christian is used (p. 190) seems far more applicable to Britain than to American (elsewhere Derrick is aware of cultural differences). But none of the book's minor flaws invalidate it as the best study which has appeared of several aspects of Lewis's religious beliefs.

Havholm, Peter, and Robert H. Smith (discussion).

"The Last Dinosaur". Wooster Alumni Magazine, 96:3 (Spring 1982), 2-5, 54. [Tolkien, p. 2].

Havholm, of the College of Wooster English Department, interviews Smith, of the Religion Department, whose book Patches of Godlight: The Pattern of Thought of C. S. Lewis appeared in 1981. Smith stresses that he sees Lewis in a Platonic as well as Christian tradition, which treats of spiritual matters as more real than everyday experiences. He finds that many read Lewis's Narnia stories at first without any awareness of religious or philosophical overtones, perhaps due to the charm of Lewis's writings. The discussion touches on Lucy Pevensie, Lewis's acknowledgement of Universal Truths (i.e., Natural Law), Lewis's attitude toward evolution, Smith's process of writing Patches of Godlight, and Lewis's conversion to Christianity. [Thanks to Margaret R. Purdy for providing a copy of this interview.]

Hemrich, Gerald I. "Blue Jade Discovered in California". Jewelry Making, Gems and Minerals, No. 520 (February 1981), 16, 18, 20.

Most of this article is a factual account of some translucent jade being mined in southern Monterey County, California. The mine, owned by Gary Ozuna of Big Sur, is named the Hobbit Blue Jade Mine, and hence this jade is known as Hobbit Blue. The word Hobbit appears seven times in the article. [Thanks to Nancy Martsch for supplying the bibliographer with this item.]

Meilaender, Gilbert [C.]. Friendship: A Study in Theological Ethics. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981. x + 118 pp. [Lewis, 41,*51-52, 79-80, *83, *104, 111nn, 113n, 114n, 116n (starred page numbers are not in the index).]

Meilaender, who wrote The Taste for the Other: The Social and Ethical Thought of C. S. Lewis (1978), here studies friendship - philia - especially as it is tension with charity - agape - in Christian thought. His first two chapters, "Friendship as a Preferential Love" and "Friendship as a Reciprocal Love", establish his basic definition of philia as a relationsship with a "genuine good will for another person and the desire that one's love be returned" - both of these underlaid with "a spirit of self-giving" (p. 50). After this is established, Meilaender discusses fidelity in friendship and the relationship between friendship and politics and between friendship and one's vocation. Most of the western literature on friendship is discussed in the book: Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Jonathan Edwards, Jeremy Taylor, and Joseph Butler receive extended treatment in the first chapter.

Obviously, Meilaender's definition is different from Lewis's in The Four Loves, for Lewis saw friendship as the rather impersonal concern of two or more persons for the same ideas, entertainments, or causes - which they met to discuss or participate in. Perhaps it is for this reason that no extended discussion of Lewis's ideas appears here. The Four Loves is quoted or cited for an anti-stoical point (p. 41), on Friendship as "a pocket of potential resistance" to public goals and responsibilities (pp. 79-80), on its giving - at its best - value to life (p. 83), and as its being perhaps "too spiritual to be entirely safe" (p. 104). The Problem of Pain is quoted on the proper treatment of selfhood (pp. 51-52).

Schackley, Myra. Rocks and Man. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977. 159 pp. [Tolkien, p. 140.]

In Schackley's chapter on "Ritual, Religion, and Magic", he writes:

> Myths and legends connected with field monuments (especially henges) are legion and have become inextricably confused with their archaeology. . . . The faintly superstitious feeling, produced by a tumulus, the awareness of what had once been there, the 'pricking of the thumbs', was evoked to perfection by J. R. R. Tolkien when he created the sinister Barrow-wights, encountered in unpleasant circumstances by Frodo on a foggy day on the Barrow-Downs.

[This reference provided by Nancy Martsch.]

Tolkien, J. R. R. The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien. Selected and edited by Humphrey Carpenter, with the assistance of Christopher Tolkien. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981. [viii] + 463 pp. Two indices. Scripts by Tolkien, pp. 125, 132, 223-224, 325, 356-357; drawings, 281. [Barfield, 22, 103, *122, 341, 363, 435n, *441n, *451n-452n; Cecil, 71, 117, 122, *438n; Coghill, *39, 359, 406, *437n, 446n; Dundas Grant, 341, *451n; Dyson, 47, 82-83, 116, 128, 161, *439n, *441n, 446n; Fox, 36, *436n; Havard, 47, 59, 68, 71, 103, 109, 117, *122, *128, *256, 341, *437n, *441n; C. S. Lewis, 14, 18, 21, 24, 29, 31-36, 38, 41, 47, 58, *59-62*, 63, (64), 65, 67-68, 71-74, 76-77, 79-81, 83-84, 89, 92-93, 95-96, 102, 105, 108-109, *113n, 117, *122, *125-129*, *130, *151n, (159), 161, *166, 169, 181, 184, 209, 224, 256, *257-258, 302, 341-342, *346, 347, *349, 350-352, 361-363, 371, 376-378, 387-389, *416, *434n-438n, *440n-441n, *451n-452n; W. H. Lewis, 47, 67, 71, 83-84, 92-93, 102-103, 117, *122, 341, 369, 430, *437n-*444n, *453; McCallum, 430, *439n; Mathew, 115; Christopher Tolkien, 22, *28, 34, 36, *40, *42, *63-112*, 112-113, *115-117*, *122, 130, *138*, 177, 185, 208, 210, *223*, 247, *261, *302*, *341, *397, 401, *403-404, 408-*409, 420-421*, 422n, 429-430, *435n, *438n-440n, *447n, *451n, *453n; Williams, 65, 67, 71-74, 79, 81, 92-95, 102-103, 105-106, 115, 118, 122, 209, *258, 339n, 341-342, 349, 361-362, *438n, *450n; Wrenn, 43, 117, 161, 238n, *443n; Inklings generally, 29, 47, 67, 71-74, *76, 79, 81-84, 92-95, 103, *116-117, 128-129, 161-162. Italicized page numbers indicate letters to the person; starred page numbers indicate a reference omitted in the index.] Reproduced in script on the back of the dust jacket is letter no. 21 (p. 28), with an additional (inconsequential) paragraph.

Carpenter collects 354 items in this volume, mostly letters (sometimes from drafts, sometimes unmailed) but also a few other - e.g., No. 183, "Notes on W. H. Auden's review of The Return of the King", pp. 238-244, and the commentary on a film treatment of The Lord of the Rings in the latter part of No. 210, "From a letter to Forrest J. Ackerman", pp. 270-277. Included in the letters are several previously printed elsewhere: No. 25, "To the editor of the 'Observer'", pp. 30-32, printed in the Observer, 20 February 1938, p. 9 (West I-37); No. 165, "To the Houghton Mifflin Co.", pp. 217-221, printed variously including material in the headnote - Harvey Breit, "In and Out of Books", The New York Times Book Review, 5 June 1955, p. 8, cols. 2-3 [subtitled "Oxford Calling"] (not in West) - and the main substance of the letter as "Tolkien on Tolkien", Diplomat, 18 (October 1966), 39 (West

I-60); No. 203, "From a letter to Herbert Schiro", p. 262, printed in Mythlore, [mis-stated by Carpenter to be Mallorn, p. 447n] 3:2/10, (1975), p. 19 (West I-76); No. 213, "From a letter to Deborah Webster", pp. 288-289, printed as an appendix to Deborah Webster Rogers and Ivor A. Rogers, J. R. R. Tolkien (Boston: Twayne Publishers [Twayne's English Authors Series, No. 304], 1980), pp. 125-126 (West I-83); No. 298, "To William Luther White", pp. 387-388, printed as an appendix in White's The Image of Man in C. S. Lewis (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969), pp. 221-222 (West I-69); No. 300, "From a letter to Walter Hooper", pp. 389, printed in part as an editorial footnote to "The Alliterative Meter" in C. S. Lewis, Selected Literary Essays (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1969), p. 18, ed. Walter Hooper (not in West); No. 316, "From a letter to R. W. Burchfield", pp. 404-405, including a definition of hobbit printed in the Oxford English Dictionary: 1976 Supplement (not in West); No. 319, "To the Editor of the Daily Telegraph", pp. 419-420, printed in that newspaper, 4 July 1972, p. 16 (West I-70). (Not all of the items previously printed are identified in this book, and there is the possibility that, for example, No. 181, pp. 232-237, and No. 294, pp. 372-378, have been printed in part.) A few misprints and editorial slips may be noted: "Mrs C. S. Lewis" (p. 24) for "Mr"; "'scientification'" (p. 274) for what is probably scientifiction - i.e., science fiction; a reference to "Isaac Azimov" (p. 377n) which may be a misprint or may be Tolkien's error for Asimov but should have been noted if the latter; a reference to "an eminent philologist (Bazell) once a pupil of mine" (p. 419) who does not appear in the index and is not identified in the editor's notes in the back of the book. A possibly misidentified cause for a letter is discussed below - the third letter to Lewis.) Editorial notes appear on pp. 433-453; the first index, of the "principle references to persons, places, objects, languages, etc. in The Hobbit, The Lord of the Rings and The Silmarillion", pp. 454-456; and the General Index, pp. 457-463. As indicated in the starred items in the headnote above, the latter is selective.

Carpenter's Introduction indicates the general approach in the selection of letters: "priority has been given to those letters where Tolkien discusses his own books; but the selection has also been made with an eye to demonstrating the huge range of Tolkien's mind and interests, and his idiosyncratic but always clear view of the world" (p. 1). In general, the earlier letters trace Tolkien's writing of his various works, and the more numerous later letters discuss the meaning of The Lord of the Rings. A large number of the letters apologize for not getting work written on time. A few examples of the letters about the meaning of his works may be mentioned. Perhaps the most important is No. 131, "To Milton Waldman", pp. 143-161, written to an editor at Collins when Tolkien thought that company would publish The Silmarillion and The Lord of the Rings together; it contains the passage in which Tolkien speaks of dedicating his myth "to England" (p. 144), and an indication that The Silmarillion once included a vision of "the end of the world, its breaking and remaking" (p. 149). Tolkien speaks of this latter as like "the Norse vision of Ragnarök", although C. S. Kilby, who presumably read a sketch of (or was told of the plans for) this version of The Silmarillion, speaks of it in terms of the Book of Revelation (Tolkien and "The Silmarillion", 1976, pp. 64-65). It is in this letter to Waldman that Tolkien says his works are "concerned with the problem of the relation of Art (and Sub-creation) and Primary Reality" (p. 145n) and the Elves' magic is Art (p. 146). The latter statement is later echoed in No. 181, "To Michael Straight [drafts]", p. 236. But Tolkien elsewhere says the theme of The Lord of the Rings is "Death and Immortality" (in No. 186, "From a letter to Joanna de Bortadano [drafts]", p. 246); even in this letter to Waldman, he says his works are "mainly concerned with Fall, Mortality, and the Machine" (p. 145). Tolkien also sums up the moral of The Lord of the Rings differently later in the letter to Waldman, p. 160. In a related topic, Tolkien tells Waldman, "I dislike Allegory - the conscious and intentional allegory - yet any attempt to explain the purport of myth or fairy-tale must use allegorical language" (p. 145). (Allegory is not in the index, but other references to it appear on pp. 121, 174, 190, 192, 212, 233, 246, 262, 284, 307, 320-321, and 351.) The necessity of the use of allegorical language probably explains Tolkien's bald statement, "Elrond symbolizes throughout the ancient wisdom, and his House represents Lore" (p. 153n). Other letters discuss his invented languages (in several letters) and such things as the Hobbits' practices of birthday presents (No. 214, "To A. C. Nunn [draft]", pp. 289-296). In short, the letters have now become an essential supplement to "On Fairy Stories" for Tolkien's theory of what he was attempting in his art, as well as giving additional details about his sub-creation.

A few examples of letters not concerned with Tolkien's works may also be given: a long and conservative statement about women, love, and sexual relationships, with some comments on his own life (No. 43, "From a letter to Michael Tolkien", pp. 48-54); and a summary of his religious beliefs (No. 250, "To Michael Tolkien, pp. 336-341). Interesting of those of this type, but for different reasons than the autobiographical letters just mentioned, are the three letters to C. S. Lewis: No. 48, "To C. S. Lewis", p. 59; No. 49, "To C. S. Lewis (draft)", pp. 59-62; and No. 113, "To C. S. Lewis", pp. 125-129. The first, of 20 April 1943, concerns the teaching of a short course on English to air force cadets. The second, probably written in 1943 and probably never sent Lewis, is a disagreement with Lewis's suggestion in Christian Behavior of secular and religious marriage offices being always separate. The third, dated Septuagesima (i.e., the third Sunday before Lent), 1948, is the most intriguing. Carpenter's headnote says that "the exact circumstances . . . are not clear" (p. 125) but that it may involve Lewis's reading from his English Literature in the Sixteenth Century before the Inklings (cf. p. 128, where Tolkien says to bring that work out for reading). The letter suggests that Tolkien had hurt Lewis, presumably by means of some verses and a letter, although they (or just the verses?) may have been criticized by Lewis ("the small things of my heart made the mere excuse for verbal butchery") and Tolkien may have responded (the letter?). At some point in the proceedings Lewis seems to have suggested Tolkien was "hyper-critical" (all of the foregoing, p. 126). If Carpenter is right, and the blow-up started with Lewis reading from his English Literature, then Tolkien's reaction must have been through identification with some author Lewis was treating harshly ("My verses and my letter were due to a sudden very acute realization . . . of the pain that may enter into authorship, both in the making and in the 'publication', which is an essential part of the full process", p. 126). But, since it is already biographically known that 1948 was the year in which Tolkien soundly condemned Lewis's The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe, it seems possible that this letter is involved in that upset. For this interpretation, the key passage appears on p. 127: "the heart of my nature to make" (that

is, to write) "probably makes me at my worst [as a critic] when the other writer's lines come too near (as do yours at times): there is liable to be a short circuit, a flash, an explosion -- and even a bad smell, one ingredient of which may be jealousy". In this outline of the event, Lewis presumably read some of his book at an Inkling's; Tolkien reacted, partly in terms of the mixture of myths (as Roger Lancelyn Green reported Tolkien saying later in the year), which might be what Lewis called hyper-critical, and partly because Lewis was invading his area of the fairy-tale. At any rate, he followed up whatever he said at the meeting with a poem and a letter -- perhaps a poem at the next meeting, at which time Lewis attacked it ("the verbal butchery"?), and a follow-up letter. Presumably Lewis, when he realized how far they had gone, offered to stop reading his works at the Inklings; hence, Tolkien asks him to "bring out OHEL [English Literature was in the Oxford History of English Literature series], with no coyness" (p. 128). Either interpretation is conjecture, but the latter at least ties to a known difference between Tolkien and Lewis in 1948.

Two poems by Tolkien are quoted in this volume: the epigraph of The Lord of the Rings ("Three Rings for the Elven-Kings under the Sky"), p. 153; and one of his clerihews on the Inklings -- this one of Coghill ("Mr. Neville [sic] Judson Coghill"), p. 359. The latter is published for the first time.

Youngberg, Ruth Tanis. Dorothy L. Sayers: A Reference Guide. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982. xxii + 178 pp. Index. [C. S. Lewis, xi, 53, 63, 68, 73, 75, 82, 93, 96, 100, 113, 116, 129, 138, 140, 141, 148, 155; W. H. Lewis, 96; Tolkien, 100, 148; Wain, 93; Williams, xi, 10, 22, 50, 64, 69, 77, 80, 82, 86, 91, 96, 97, 113, 116, 119, 148; Inklings generally, 93, 96, 97, 103, 111, 125, 139, 152.]

Youngberg's annotated checklist of secondary materials on Sayers, arranged by year, is a good, professional job. Her annotated list of reviews shows amazing thoroughness, although she misses those of Nancy-Lou Patterson on Sayersana in Mythprint and Mythlore; she also misses E. R. Gregory's damning review of Robert B. Harmon and Margaret A. Burger's An Annotated Guide to the Works of Dorothy L. Sayers (1977)--in Analytic and Enumerative Bibliography, 3:2 (April 1979), 138-144--in which Gregory shows that their annotations of the content of some of the mystery novels are plagiarized. (He actually demonstrates it of only one, but it is also true of others.)

In Youngberg's "Introduction" she mentions the critics who complain of the influence of Lewis and Williams on Sayers' thinking about Dante (p. xi). Examples later in the volume are Charles S. Singleton (item 1950-5, p. 69), who regrets the influence of Williams only, so far as the annotation shows; Dudley Fitts (1955-10, p. 75), who says her views are too like Lewis's; J. J. Semper (1955-18, p. 77), who complains of Williams' "erratic theories"; Thomas G. Bergin (1957-17, p. 82), who mentions the influence of Lewis and Williams, but does not seem to complain of it, from the annotation; Geoffrey L. Bickersteth (1958-9, p. 86), who thinks the Italian Dantists know more than Williams.

There are also a large number of writers who happily associate her with Lewis and Williams--and sometimes Tolkien--as Christian writers. These seem to start in 1947 with Edward Wagenecht (1947-16, p. 63), comparing her to Lewis only. James O. Supple (1949-21, p. 68) also thinks of Lewis; Ruth R. Gambee (1969-6, p. 100) thinks of Lewis and Tolkien; W. W. Robson, in Modern English Literature (1970-7, p. 103), associates her with "Anglo-Oxford"; George L. Scheper (1973-17, p. 113) and Bastian Kruithof (1974-9, p. 116), with both Lewis and Williams; and an anonymous reviewer (1978-4, p. 139), with the Inklings. Most of the foregoing comparisons are in reviews, which because of their treatment of Sayers have escaped the bibliographers of Lewis, Tolkien, and Williams. Of course, there are more serious discussions of Sayers' relationships with one or more of these writers: Kathleen Nott's attack on Sayers and Lewis in The Emperor's Clothes (1954-4, p. 73) is well known, as are--in a more positive way--Charles Moorman's study of Sayers' literary relationship to Williams, in particular, in The Precincts of Felicity (1966-5, p. 97), and Humphrey Carpenter's references in The Inklings (1979-12, p. 148). Joe R. Christopher's "Dorothy L. Sayers and the Inklings" (1976-8, p. 125) is outdated (although, for other reasons, it is not here annotated); Sylvia Schaeffer's "Sayers and C. S. Lewis" (1977-49, p. 138) seems to be on their correspondence; Carol Ann Brown's "Notes for a Lost Eulogy" (1978-7, p. 140) uses the gimmick of Lewis's lost funeral eulogy on Sayers to provide a basis for a survey of her works; and Lawrence W. Cobb's "A Gift from the Sky: The Creative Process in Lewis and Sayers" (1978-10, p. 141) was mimeographed only.

Some primary material by Lewis and Williams appears. Williams review Sayers' Strong Poison (1930-16, p. 10--Youngberg could not locate a copy of this review to annotate--The Nine Tailors (1934-23, p. 22), and The Mind of the Maker (1941-30, p. 50). Lewis reviews The Mind of the Maker also (1942-17, p. 53), refers to her in "Wain's Oxford" (1963-6, p. 93), and writes her some letters, later collected by W. H. Lewis (1966-4, p. 96).

Winkler, Anthony C., and Jo Ray McCuen, eds. Exposition: Model Paragraphs and Essays. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1982. x + 354 pp. [Lewis, 199-200, Tolkien, 257.]

This text book arranges selections under different modes of development according to the pattern of single paragraphs, two paragraphs, short essays, long essay, student essay. Under the mode of classification appears two paragraphs by C. S. Lewis, "Divisions of Humanity", pp. 199-200, with a vocabulary list; comprehension, rhetorical, and discussion questions; vocabulary exercises; and writing assignments following, pp. 200-201. A brief biography of Lewis and analysis of the passage precedes the selection, p. 199. The passage is the second and third paragraphs of "What Christians Believe" in Broadcast Talks.

In the section on classification and division, a student paper (without any of the teaching devices which accompany Lewis's paper) appears, Liane Frost's "Hobbits and Elves" (p. 257). She contrasts the appearance, habitats, and cultures of the two races.

Word of Mouth

Over the years it has been found that the single most frequent reason readers give for their initial knowledge of Mythlore is by the introduction of a friend. If you do enjoy Mythlore and want to help it continue to improve and grow, why not show copies to your friends who might also find it to their interests.

Continued from page 28

Letter 294, page 377, second footnote. Issac "Azimov". The correct spelling is Asimov. Dr. Asimov also enjoys reading Professor Tolkien, just as Tolkien enjoyed reading Asimov. See "All and Nothing" in the January 1981 Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction, with a brief and excellent essay on re-reading The Lord of the Rings (pages 103-104): "Each time I liked it better than the time before, and on this fifth occasion I clamored restlessly against having it end at all."